

Patent Application No. 09/468,581
Attorney Docket No. 81870.0007

REMARKS:

Claims 3, 13, 17, and 20 are amended. Support for the amendments to claims 3, 13, and 17 can be found on page 9, lines 1-11 of the Applicant's specification. Claims 3-10, 13-15, and 17-24 are pending in the application. No new matter is added. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C § 112:

Claims 20-22 stand rejected under 37 C.F.R § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The Office states that in claims 20-22, there is insufficient antecedent basis for the limitation "the mother monitor." The Office suggests that the limitation be changed to "the first display device". In response, the limitation has been changed in the manner suggested by the Office. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

CLAIM REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C § 103:

Claims 3, 9-10, 13, 15, and 17-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milner (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,410) in view of Gouko (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,507). The outstanding Office Action lists claims "3, 9-10, 13, 15, 15, and 17-24" as being rejected. Applicant believes this a typographical error and this should read "3, 9-10, 13, 15, and 17-24." Therefore, Applicant will proceed as though claim 13 was rejected. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 3, as amended, is as follows:

A multi-monitor, comprising:
a first display device having a display screen;

Patent Application No. 09/468,581
Attorney Docket No. 81870.0007

a second display device having a display screen smaller than the first display device; and

a supporting mechanism which is mountable on an outside portion of the first display device, and supports the second display device rotatably about a first axis and a second axis intersecting the first axis,

wherein the first axis is parallel with a horizontal direction of the display screen of the first display device, and the second axis is parallel with a vertical direction of the display screen of the first display device, and

wherein the supporting mechanism includes:

a first support member which supports the second display device rotatably about the first and second axes; and

a second support member which is mounted on at least one of a side portion and a top portion of the first display device, and supports the first support member slidably in parallel with either one of the vertical and horizontal directions of the display screen of the first display device,

wherein the first support member includes an arm, and the arm is connected to both the second display device and the second support member.

Applicant respectfully submits that Milner and Gouko cannot render claim 3 obvious. Claim 3, as amended, is directed to a multi-monitor, wherein the first support member includes an arm, and the arm is connected to both the second display device and the second support member.

Milner is directed to a patient monitor: "For easy patient viewing, as seen in FIG. 3, the patient monitor 30 support arm 34 must allow the monitor to be positioned at any location within handy reach of the patient and allow the monitor to be tilted up or down for viewing. The solution chosen was an articulated arm 34

Patent Application No. 09/468,581
Attorney Docket No. 81870.0007

with rotating joint 62 at first end 64, and rotating joint 66 at second end 68, as well as at the elbow 35 junction. The monitor 30 attaches to the arm 34 on a swivel mount 40 which allows the monitor 30 to be tilted up or down approximately 30 degrees from level." (Milner, column 9, lines 12-21). Thus, in Milner there are two arms 34 and 68, joined at an elbow 35 that are used to connect the patient monitor 30 to the mounting attachment 72. (Milner, Figure 3, and column 9, lines 32-38). Therefore, Milner fails to teach or suggest a multi-monitor, wherein the first support member includes an arm, and the arm is connected to both the second display device and the second support member.

The present invention has the advantage that only a single arm is needed to support the second display device rotatably about the first and second axes.

Gouko cannot remedy the defect of Gouko and is not relied upon by the Office for such. Instead, the Office cites Gouko for teaching a "multi-monitor (a personal computer having a plurality of display panels (see col. 1, lines 5-6), comprising: a first display device 2 (Gouko says the main panel 2 as a primary display panel) having a display screen 2a (a display surface 2a); a second display device 3 (Gouko says the sub panel 3 as a secondary display panel) having a display screen smaller than the first display device 2 (see figure 1; col. 3, lines 23-28, and line 37)."

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that Milner and Gouko could not have made amended claim 3 obvious, because the combination of references do not teach or suggest each and every claim limitation.

Claims 9 and 10 depend from claim 3, and as such include all the limitations of amended claim 3, and therefore cannot be made obvious for at least the same reasons as claim 3. Withdrawal of these rejections is thus respectfully requested.

Claim 13, as amended, requires the limitation that the first support member includes an arm, and the arm is connected to both the main body and the second support member. Claim 17, as amended, requires the limitation that the first support member includes an arm, and the arm is connected to both the auxiliary display device and the second support member. Both of these claims are patentable

Patent Application No. 09/468,581
Attorney Docket No. 81870.0007

over Milner and Gouko for the same reasons as discussed above. Withdrawal of these rejections is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 15 and 18-24 depend from independent claims 13 and 17, respectively, and therefore contain all the limitations of independent claims 13 and 17. As such, claims 15 and 18-24 are patentable for at least the same reasons as claims 13 and 17. Withdrawal of these rejections is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 4, 6, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milner (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,410) in view of Gouko (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,507) as applied to claims 3 and 13 above, and further in view of Crossland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,720,781). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 4 and 6 depend from amended claim 3 and as such include all the limitations of claim 3. Claim 14 depends from amended claim 13, and as such includes all the limitations of claim 13. Therefore, these claims cannot be rendered obvious over Milner and Gouko, for at least the same reasons as discussed above. Crossland cannot remedy the defect of Milner and Gouko and is not relied upon by the Office for such. Instead, the Office cites Crossland for teaching "a multi-monitor device having a first display 2 and a second display device 3 (Crossland calls an office terminal having a first and a second flat panel display modules 2 and 3. See FIG.1), and the first and the second display devices are driven by an operating system, for example MIRTOS (Crossland says an operating system, e.g. MIRTOS, is used to support module software driven the display modules) (see Col. 4, lines 6-23)."

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references either alone or in combination could not have made claims 4, 6, and 14 obvious because the combination of references do not teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of these rejections is thus respectfully requested.

Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milner (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,410) and Gouko (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,507) in view of

Patent Application No. 09/468,581
Attorney Docket No. 81870.0007

Crossland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,720,781) as applied to claim 4 above, and further in view of Register (U.S. Patent No. 5,590,021). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claim 5 depends from amended claim 3 and as such includes all the limitations of claim 3, and therefore cannot be rendered obvious over Milner, Gouko, and Crossland for the same reasons as discussed above. Register cannot remedy the defect of Milner, Gouko, and Crossland and is not relied upon by the Office for such. Instead, the Office cites Register for teaching "a multi-monitor system (See FIG.1) including a first image signal output device 12 (a computer 12) which outputs an image signal representing an image to be displayed on the display screen 29 of the first display device 16 (the display monitor 16), and a second image signal output device 24 (a display controller 24) which outputs an image signal representing an image to be displayed on the screen 28 of the second display device 22 (a liquid crystal display module 22) (See FIGS. 1 and 2; col. 3, lines 28-64)."

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references either alone or in combination could not have made claim 5 obvious because the combination of references do not teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of this rejection is thus respectfully requested.

Claims 7 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Milner (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,410) and Gouko (U.S. Patent No. 6,222,507) and Crossland et al. (U.S. Patent No. 4,720,781) as applied to claims 1, 4, and 6 above, and further in view of Fowler (U.S. Patent No. 6,302,612). Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Claims 7 and 8 depend from amended claim 3 and as such include all the limitations of claim 3, and therefore cannot be rendered obvious over Milner, Gouko, and Crossland for the same reasons as discussed above. Fowler cannot remedy the defect of Milner, Gouko, and Crossland and is not relied upon by the Office for such. Instead, the Office cites Fowler for teaching "a multi-monitor including a first display device 110 (the primary LCD 110) hinged mounted to base computer 100 (a

Patent Application No. 09/468,581
Attorney Docket No. 81870.0007

base 100) and a second display device 111 (a hidden secondary LCD 111) (See FIGS. 9 and 10; and col. 4, lines 4-6). Fowler further teaches the use of a first wiring 109 (a ribbon wire 109) which connects the image signal output device 105 (a base 105) with a first display device 101 (a primary LCD 101) (See FIG. 8; col. 3, line 2, and lines 63-64), and a second wiring 127 (a connecting wire 127) which connects the image signal output device 100 with the second display device 111 (See FIG. 11; col. 4, lines 17-27)."

In light of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited references either alone or in combination could not have made claims 7 and 8 obvious because the combination of references do not teach or suggest each and every claim limitation. Withdrawal of these rejections is thus respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Reexamination and reconsideration of the application, as amended, are requested.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at the Los Angeles, California telephone number (213) 337-6810 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance.

Patent Application No. 09/468,581
Attorney Docket No. 81870.0007

If there are any fees due in connection with the filing of this response, please charge the fees to our Deposit Account No. 50-1314.

Respectfully submitted,

HOGAN & HARTSON L.L.P.

By:

Lawrence J. McClure
Lawrence J. McClure
Registration No. 44,228
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Date: August 22, 2003

500 South Grand Avenue, Suite 1900
Los Angeles, California 90071
Phone: 213-337-6700
Fax: 213-337-6701

FAX RECEIVED

AUG 25 2003

GROUP 2600

OFFICIAL